DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 513 EA 021 233

AUTHOR Noblit, George W.; And Others
TITLE The Politics of Planning: Political Clientelism in Educational Innovation.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cooperative Planning; *Educational Innovation; *Policy Formation; Political Power; Political Socialization; *Politics of Education; *Power Structure; Secondary Education; *Social Networks; Teacher Administrator Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *North Carolina

ABSTRACT

In the absence of a planning strategy, politics and expediency will take over an educational innovation and lead it astray. Formal planning is in many ways a controlling device, but it is also a potential enabling device through which participants can affect their futures. One academic year was spent studying three suburban or rural schools' political clientelism among the professional structures both on the school level and on the centralized planning level of the district; two of the schools were junior highs, and the third was a high school. Forty percent of the teachers, the principals, and other administrators were interviewed. The order observed in the schools' planning was as much a product of the political structure within the school--the irrational--as it was a product of the rational structure; the compelling local interest in the schools was a defense of the status quo in terms of the principal's authority and the existing planning structure. In conclusion, it possibly is better not to conceive of planning as a rational process, but as a contention around which interests are expressed and alliances are formed. (10 references and 2 tables) (KM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED310513

# The Politics of Planning: Political Clientelism in Educational Innovation

by

George W. Noblit

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

R. Dwight Hare

Northeast Louisiana University

Barnett Berry

Southeastern Regional Council

for Educational Improvement

Paper prepared for American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, April, 1985: Chicago, Ill:

EA 021 233

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

George W. Noblit

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# The Politics of Planning: Political Clientelism in Educational Innovation

by

George W. Noblit

R. Dwight Hare

Barnett Berry

Textbooks admonish us that the key to successful implementation of an educational innovation is adequate planning (cf Herriott and Gross, 1979; Cunningham, 1982). Typically we are advised to convene a representative group, set goals, examine alternative means, choose the most appropriate means, and use the resulting plan to guide the implementation and later evaluation. Certainly this seems to be reasonable advice, but like much practical advice that is not being discussed is why all this seems necessary. What is not being said is that in the absence of a planning strategy, politics and expediency will take over the innovation and lead it astray. The rationality of the planning process seemingly gives us faith that this will not occur.

Yet politics does not have to follow the rules of rationality whether that be in party politics or the politics within a school. Interest groups can use planning to further their own interests as well as to promote the official interests. In Gouldner's (1970) terms, the conflict here is between legitimacy (what you ought to do) and authenticity (what you wish to do). Planning is in many ways a control device (goals are often prescribed and limits set for planning groups), but it is also a potential enabling device through which participants can affect their futures. Those who participate in planning may

recognize that "planning as enabling" is a vehicle to promote their authentic interests as well as the one's sought by those in authority.

The planning literature is essentially innovative (i.e. trying to establish a belief) and tends to be framed as a vehicle to enhance participants' commitment to the organization, its goals, and plans (cf. Herriott and Gross, 1979) In this way, planning is in the language of legitimacy: it promotes definitions of what we should do. This one sideness has had some dire consequences for the field of planning as a whole. Clark (et al. 1980;3) suggest that the field is imbued in an incorrect paradigm:

> ...the failure of goal-based, rational planning is grounded not in the technical details of the systems but in the discrepancy between assumptions underlying them and the reality of what actually occurs in educational organizations. The logic-in-use in most educational organizations most of the time may be so disparate from the reconstructed logic of supporting rational planning systems that no level of improvement in the design or implementation of such systems could significantly affect the usefulness of the systems.

Clark et al. go on to propose a more holistic approach to planning that is based in metaphoric analyses. In social policy planning, Hibbard (1981) proposed the solution based in a "meta planning point of view (p.562)." Both of these solutions, interestingly, assume that there is some difficulty in conceptualizing the irrational elements of planning. It is our contention that this conceptual blindness is another reflection of the rationalistic beliefs of in modern world. Mannheim (1936:116) long ago addressed this same issue and

argued the irrational is knowable:

> The two main sources of irrationalism in the social structure (uncontrolled competition and domination by force) constitute the realm of social life which is still unorganized and where politics becomes necessary. Around these two centers there accumulate those other more profound irrational elements, which we call emotions.

The irrational there is appropriately conceptualized as politics and authentic beliefs (emotions). In social anthropology, these "irrational" elements have become conceptualized as "political clientelism."

Political clientelism focuses on the social networks among people and the power relations within and between networks (Schmidt et al, 1977). These networks are based in exchanges of favors (or vengenances) and, may establish relatively equal power among the network members (friends) or exploitative power relations (e.g. patron-client relations in which the client exchanges loyality and deference for the support and protection of the patron). Further, networks may also have an ideational base and promote some value(s). Factions are networks that find solidarity through opposition to other networks and ideas.

The politics of planning, then requires that we go beyond the rational model as suggested by Clark et al and Hibbard, but in seeking holism we must be conceptually clear that planning is an area where the forces of legitimacy do combat with forces of authenticity: where rational authority is contested by the authentic beliefs and political alliances of the irrational.

## The Ethnography

We were invited by the school system (Caduceus County, a pseudonym) to study the "change process" of "professionalizing" teachers by modyfing the

formal organization of pilot schools. The district administration assumed that qualitative research was not likely to be provocative and could also provide "baseline" data from which they might assess how much change resulted. Their view was that description was apolitical.

Our view was not so naive, but our explanations were insufficient to alter the district administration's assumptions. In the end we contracted to provide the district with case studies of each school as the primary product, and invited to study the entire innovation.

As the innovation had a centralized planning scheme that was to be the basis on which the individual schools designed their "professional structure", we attended the centralized planning meetings, interviewed the participants (who included principals of the pilot schools, university-based consultants, teacher representatives and district administrators), and collected the documents that were generated as the background to the planning of individual schools. In all, one academic year was spent studying these activities.

Near the end of the academic year, we began the studies of the schools who were to be "pilots" in designing a professional structure. We visited each school repeatedly, interviewed the principal, the "core staffs" to the design effort, and using snowball sampling investigated each of the political networks among the staff about the "understanding," the district thought were central to the effort. We followed each school's planning through the summer and documented the plan that was implemented in the fall.

For the purpose of our analysis here, we will explore only three schools: Howard, Dixon and Academy (2 junior high and one high school) (names also pseudonyms). Our analysis is presented through the case studies of each school. We visited each school, conducted interviews with approximately 40% of the

teaching staff, the principal, and other administrators. All faculty were surveyed concerning current "professional" practices (as delineated by the central office's "guiding principles"), and we also monitored the "core" staff at each school that developed the plans for the school's particular program, and the final plan that was submitted by each school and approved by the district. For our program here, we will show how the political networks within each school affected, and were affected by the rational planning process (For more details see Berry, 1984).

The Setting

The Cadaceus County Schools are located in a major technological and industrial area of North Carolina. While the system is located in a county with an approximate population of 200,000, the schools are located in suburban and rural areas. Of the twenty-three schools in the system most are located in suburbia.

The suburban areas are influential in school policy and since they are middle class and upper middle class, tend to share values concerning cosmopolitan school policy, leadership in state educational affairs, and probably, more importantly, a "bureaucratic thought structure" (Warren, et al, 1974). That is, the suburban community wishes to believe it is progressive in its educational policy and defined that largely in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, accountability and clear lines of authority.

While 30% of the system's 17,000 students are minority, it is important to note that Caduceus County Schools surround an inner-city school system which is predominately minority (90 percent). The city itself is stratified by race and class and is currently investing considerable public monies in improving its image and overcoming urban "blight", as many refer to it. Nevertheless, the

county is the preferred place to live and to educate one's children.

In 1980 Caduceus County Schools embarked on a change effort to make more effective its personnel management system and to professionalize its teacher workforce. Originally, the intent of the change was to design "an organizational structure which might help build a culture among teachers and administrators which could lead to the valuing and reinforcing of technical teaching skills". A Personnel Study Committee (PSC) comprised primarily of administrators was formed to "identify fixed indicators", "establish high standards", and to "design a total process approach from recruitment to evaluation". Over the 1982-83 academic year, the PSC formed subcommittees to identify the "guiding principles" to direct their comprehensive personnel management system. These guidelines addressed recruitment, selection, socialization, continuous training, observation, evaluation and retention, and a differentiated staffing concept. These were seen as necessary to begin the process of increasing the professionalization of teachers.

After a year of "modifying or completely scrapping ideas", the PSC recognized that the change effort was entering "the most crucial phase" as their small committee "must now involve a wider audience". This meant that as teachers from eight pilot schools were selected to serve as "core staffs" in developing professional plans for their respective schools, there would be a "change in emphasis from a closed environment to an open one". In fact, a central office administrator who facilitated the change effort, noted that their "basic rule of thumb was to involve only those people who need to be involved at any given point and to be sure that we give them clear and meaningful directions". In order to "develop a specific plan of action quicker than could be accomplished in a group of fourteen people" and "to give legitimacy to what we present", a

steering committee was formed to "deal with the steps for involving teachers in the proposed system", and ultimately, to put "the show on the road". The core staff were asked to "review the literature provided by the steering committee and, in the context of the rationales and guiding principles developed by the steering committee, submit a plan for implementation" for their respective schools. As the pilot school plan for implementation was to "reflect values and guidelines," the principles themselves served as the "professional model" by which the system attempted to reorganize its teacher workforce into a differentiated staffing structure.

## Letting Authencity In

In Benson's (1981) terms, the administration designed a "morphology". They wrestled with the ideas of the central office and in the end proposed a rather rationalistic model to professionalize the teaching workforce. Professionalism ended up completing a plan which the district accepted, we will see that these ideas were generally not objected to by the three teaching staff--with the exception of the differentiation issue. Formal differenciation can have a dramatic effect on the power of the teachers and local administrator networks. Each school wrestled this "morphology" and wrought their solution in part in the form of the plan they each submitted.

## Howard Junior High

### School, Mission, and Climate.

Howard Junior High School was a well-kept, modern facility and there appeared to be an importance attached to this appearance. The 750 students came from primarily middle and upper-middle class backgrounds and tended to score three

years above their respective grade levels on standardized reading and math measures. The principal characterized the student population as "one-third GT (gifted and talented)." In some respects, Howard took on the aura of a private, prep-type school in that most students shared common backgrounds, and it was assumed that they would attend universities for further education. An integral part of the mission of the school was the life of the student outside of the classroom. The principal asserted that there "may be too much going on," but teachers "want to add and add" and he "didn't know where to cut." Hence, the administration and many teachers contributed to and reinforced the community's expectations concerning student life outside of the classroom.

Howard's climate was characterized as "open." The faculty lounge, with numerous sofas and comfortable chairs, was well-utilized by many teachers to discuss each others' lives, students, classrooms, professional issues. and extracurricular assignments and activities. Student life was "structured," but with "concerned, caring teachers" there were high standards for "discipline and decorum."

The Principal.

The principal described himself as having a "holistic" view of the school. He was "ends" oriented and believed strongly in "planning and organization" and "keeping people informed." The faculty characterized him as an "accessible" administrator who was fair, open, and respected. For many, he got "done what had to be done." He was a "straight and religious" man.

While many teachers tended to view extracurricular assignments as being "drafted," the principal noted that he "asks people to volunteer for what they're interested in so they won't have to do something that they don't want to do." Most teachers were expected to be independent once they were given an

assignment as the principal had "no time to retrain" teachers for the numerous duties at the school.

Teachers.

Of the 46 faculty members at Howard, 5 were black, 10 were male, and 15 had master's degrees (with the remaining having B.S. or B.A. degrees). There was a bimodal distribution of faculty in terms of teaching experience--approximately 40% had less than 4 years and 40% had more than 11 years. There appeared to be little consensus concerning the definition of "best teachers" at Howard. Those that were, tended to be defined as "naturals," "good communicators," "knowing their material," "having a holistic view of the lives of students," and "never coming to the lounge."

Formal Leadership

Along with the principal, the formal leadership structure at Howard included an assistant principal and five coordinators (representing the departments of science, English, social studies, vocations, and math).

The assistant principal's responsibilities included teacher observation, textbook distribution, serving as a liason between principal and staff, and enforcing student discipline. The principal emphasized the assistant principal's role as a disciplinarian by saying, "he does it better than I do." The coordinators' responsibilities included sharing information with teachers in their respective departments and serving on the core staff and media committees. Some coordinators had begun observations of teachers in their departments. While on the media committee, coordinators were expected to "fight for their budgets." while staying "in the black."

The principal stated that the criteria for the selection of the assistant principal and the coordinators were difficult to reconstruct, as the selections

were made some time ago. However, he indicated that they were the "appropriate" people. The coordinators reported widely divergent criteria and circumstances for their selection, ranging from "I asked to do it," through "no one else wanted to do it," to "it was a fluke (trading another assignment for this one)." The coordinators were characterized as "wanting to do administrative work--not one of the boys or girls," being "experienced and dependable," and "dedicated to the administration and their personal advancement." It was generally perceived that "seniority counted a lot" in the selection of formal leadership roles at Howard: The principal noted that these department coordinators were selected to serve on the core staff because of their role in the "existing structure." Some members of the core staff/coordinator team viewed themselves as different from the rest of staff: being "more knowledgeable," having divergent "interests, attitudes, and concerns," and being subject to some "professional jealousy." Some non-core faculty did not necessarily share this perception. However, others noted that the core/coordinators were the "ones having the secret meetings"--reflecting that they were beginning to have "pull in decision-making" and indicating that "animosity" was evident among the faculty regarding the "power of the position." The ethos of this core group was "academic," and their primary focus was the classroom performance of students and teachers. Nevertheless, "there were other leaders."

The Political Networks.

The informal leadership structure at Howard Junior High was demarcated by two major political networks, distinguished by their orientation towards teaching. One network was concerned with "academics" which they defined as a "subject-centered" approach. The teachers in this network had a tendency to be perceived as "experts and advisors." The other network "activities," was more

"child-centered" and inclined to take responsibility for school sponsored student activities. These two networks closely approximated Mary Metz' (1978) distinction between incorporative and developmental approaches to instruction. The incorporative approach has the goal of "teaching subjects" thus filling the "empty vessel" of a student with the body of knowledge. The developmental approach has the goal of "teaching children" thus allowing students to learn attitudes, interests, and more generalized skills. The "academic" network included many of those who held formal leadership positions (coordinators). On the other hand, the teachers in the "activities" network were less likely to hold formal leadership positions. This was not to say, however, that they were not respected for their classroom teaching or that they were without influence. The status of "best teacher" was not network dependent. When asked to nominate "best teachers," faculty picked both those within and outside their respective networks. As certain programs such as "art and music got all they want" from the budget (media) committee, it appeared that the "academic" network tended to have more formal authority while the "activities" network tended to have responsibility for and was the social life of the school. Thus, it was the latter network that had high visibility to the community. Furthermore, scarce resources contributed to some competition between networks and between those with more formal "authority" and those with "responsibility" for student activities. What emerged was an essential bifurcation of the networks. Those in the "academic" network were inclined to associate themselves with teachers and positional power while those in the "activity" network were inclined to associate themselves with students and feel personal responsibility. As students were not regarded as discipline problems, they tended to bridge the two networks. Therefore, there were <u>a few</u> "boundary spanners" for those who were

incorporative and have formal authority, and for those who were developmental and felt personal responsibility. In sum, those nominated as "best teachers" were not necessarily those with formal authority positions. Those nominated as "leaders" were not necessarily nominated as the best teachers nor were those who felt personal responsibility for the multitude of student activities necessarily the best teachers. As a general rule, a core of those who were believed to be good teachers were most likely to resist and be successful at resisting additional formal assignment. In fact, they were unlikely to be assigned these additional assignments as they had developed their own additional assignments. In sum, the "best teachers" at Howard could resist both formal authority and responsibility for student activities, as the best teachers were more a status than a network.

Survey Results.

The survey asked teachers to agree or disagree with the central offices "understandings" about the personnel management system. In this way, we can assess the degree to which the faculty as a whole shared the "morphology" perpetrated by the PSC. In Table 1, the teacher responses for each item are presented. At Howard Junior High, the teachers tended to agree that hiring procedures are known, but were equivocal concerning whether the criteria for hiring were known, undecided if the criteria are in fact employed in selection. Rather they tended to view administrators as seeking the same qualities in new personnel that they possess. Teachers themselves were either in favor of more involvement in recruitment and selection or were undecided.

Concerning the orientation of new staff, the teachers at Howard believed that knowledge about effective practices were already being conveyed to new personnel, but were less sure of these practices are conveyed by the most

knowledgeable, and were essentially equivocal that activities are planned for new staff to understand these practices. Howard teachers also tended to agree that observation for evaluation occurred frequently, was conducted by qualified persons, and that it also identified strengths as well as weaknesses. The teachers were equivocal concerning whether the observation for evaluation process revealed ways to improve practice but were a bit more optimistic that it was being conducted effectively.

At Howard, teachers saw staff development as centering first on job-related problems, second on opportunities for professional growth, third on personal growth. Interestingly, the teachers were less certain that staff development had actually clarified the responsibilities of the job. Howard teachers tended to agree that teachers with demonstrated high levels of competency should have differential status and pay, and rather strongly agreed that these teachers should train others. Nevertheless, the teachers also thought that those with such a status should be regularly evaluated. They seemed to think that the status should not be considered as permanent. Finally, the teachers at Howard thought that competencies were shared by effective teachers and can be taught, but tended to believe they were not being taught.

In short, the teachers perceived that recruitment and selection was not as visible as the PSC desired, that orientation occurred but not by the most knowledgeable or through planned activities. The teachers indicated that observation for evaluation tended to meet the PSC's guidelines that were less sure it occurred frequently, was conducted effectively and equivocal on revealing ways to improve. Staff development seems to have emphasized problems and growth over the responsibilities of job.

The Plan.

The Core Staff and the Principal at Howard met and developed a plan over the Spring and Summer of 1983. The proposed plan for professionalization at the school further formalized the present departmental structure with the addition of a full-time instructional coordinator "to function on a level between administrator and teacher." The existing department coordinators (math, science, social studies, language arts, and vocations) would become "core teachers" and would continue to teach the majority of the day. However, they would also spend an additional "forty-five minutes during the day, two hours after school per week, and two weeks during the summer to help implement (the school's) plan." Both the instructional coordinator and the core teachers would be selected "from written applications" by the principal--primarily on the basis of "credentials, experience and a willingness/interest to assume (the) pertinent responsibilities." The plan indicated that "all present faculty would be given an opportunity to apply."

The plan intended for the instructional coordinator to "focus" on the organization of the tasks and efforts of all the work groups within the school (but primarily those organized by departments and the core teachers). The specific task of the work groups was to "insure quality instruction and design a system that (would) build on the existing professional norms of competence."

Thus the plan at Howard failed the PSC in two important ways. First, selection to a differentiated status was not to be based on "technical norms of competence," but on rather traditional criteria. Second, the plan rather than creating a new structure embellished the existing structure with little change in who has authority. Certainly, the plan has resulted in more teacher involvement in selection, orientation and staff development, but in careful reading of the plan also will indicate that the emphasis is on facilitating

primarily the core staff's involvement in selection and orientation. Further, it is the core staff who will be made available for more planning and staff development. Observation and evaluation remain unchanged.

Cui Bono

In political contests it is common to try to assess "cui bono" (who benefits). It is evident that the plan itself was formulated by the existing coordinators, who were members of the "academic" network, and that the plan ended up reinforcing the authority of members of that network. The only change in core staff membership that resulted was the replacement of an "academic" with another "academic" who also held the status of "best teacher." These same people would receive more training which in turn would further legitimate the structure. The principal who did lose some ability to serve as an informal patron to the staff, also benefitted in that the new criteria were not bound to technical teaching competence, but to the responsibilities of the coordinator role and in that final selection of coordinators was legitimated as the principal's perogative. The "activities" network never was involved, and seemingly the new process will do like for their power or viewpoint. Finally, the "best teachers" continued to use their status to eschew participation in the additional responsibilities now to be accomplished. That is, those who the PSC interested in differentiating into leadership roles remained uninvolved. At Howard; the contention of the PSC's morphology and local definitions of authenticity resulted in a plan the district judged acceptable but not one that would professionalize teaching through an emphasis on, and reward of, technical norms of competence in teaching.

## DIXON JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

### School, Mission, Climate

Students at Dixon Junior High School came from six feeder schools and from "blue-collar," "housing project," and "tenant farming" backgrounds. Traditionally, faculty, parents, and students at Dixon have had "low expectations" for the school and its "clients"--the students, themselves. The school has had a "bad reputation." However, the principal, a man who has "high expectations," came into the school 5 years ago and "got really tough." The principal "put sound, consistent discipline in effect" and "got rid of the 17-and 18-year olds (by) suspending them for an infraction." The 590 students tended to score their respective grade levels on standardized reading and math measures. However, the principal noted that "our top is at the median (of other middle/junior high schools in the district)." The principal, a former coach himself, had put a high emphasis on athletics along with academics. He felt that sports could provide a "strong role model" for kids from certain backgrounds. For sports such as "football and track," which traditionally attracted black students, there has been a need for him to "recruit" the right coach to "motivate" these "kids to go out." Other sports such as baseball and softball "do not need as strong a role model in the coach."

Dixon Junior High School was in "chaos" before the present principal arrived four years ago. Now the halls are noticeably clean, quiet, and empty except for administrators and occassionally a teacher since the administration tended not to allow any "unstructured movement by students." Teachers supervised students during the mornings, break, the three different lunch periods, and after school. A computer scheduled the rotation of these teachers for this assignment--until the last week of school when "ALL TEACHERS WILL BE ON DUTY." Some students delt Dixon is "too strict," others say it is "ok." For

some teachers, students appeared to be comfortable" and "safe" in a "well-run" school as the principal was perceived to have "accomplished a lot." Students have "time to talk with their peers, but they know their limits."

## The Principal

It appears that no characterization of the school climate at Dixon can be separated from the leadership style of the principal. For the principal, if he "errs" in terms of leadership style, it is in "overstructuring." He noted that "I am not a good old boy" and "I'm here in a role ... I keep some distance," establishing a "professional relationship (as) I have found the other way gives a mixed signal." For teachers, he is "not popular," a "bit dictatorial," "unique," "very thorough and concientious." For one teacher, "he is a very rational man ... an astute observer of what goes on." He "looks around and sees his team players" and, as a former coach, ran his "team"--i.e., faculty and students. He noted, "I'm not here for fun and games." However, for him, winning at Dixon included providing an atmosphere where students are "safe" and "disciplined" while still "enjoying their school." Dixon's climate was characterized as "formal" and "uncomfortable" for teachers, but some saw it changing. Most noted that he had to be "authoritarian" to be "effective," sees faculty members (as less of) a threat, he is more relaxed and open." One teacher summed up the climate and leadership style of the principal at the school by noting that he is "somebody to dislike ... but he won't be appreciated until he leaves."

## Teachers

Of the 40 faculty members at Dixon, 10 were black, 15 were male, and 13 had master's degrees (with the remaining having B.S. or B.A. degrees). In terms of

years of experience, 20 teachers had less than 5, twelve had between 6 and 10, and eight had between 11 and 15 years. Dixon had a relatively young staff which is perceived to be "electic--no one lives in the community," "independent by virtue of ages," and "insular." While some teachers noted that the faculty was "dependent, not secure," others noted that they were "never intimidated." Other characterizations included "burned-out," "frustrated," and "existing day-to-day." There was no consensus among the faculty as to who are the "best teachers." While the few "older" teachers tended to be characterized as "cynical" and "more suspicious," they also were seen as "more competent" and having "disciplined classes." The problem that many of these "older faculty" faced was they "they wished they could teach Shakespeare and they (end up) having to teach second-grade reading." The younger faculty tended to be characterized as "immature," "cut-ups," and "less competent" in subject matter. However, they showed lots of "enthusiasm," and if they were not "excellent" teachers, they at least saw themselves as "good" ones. Even though these "young" teachers tended not to be nominated to the status of best teacher by fellow teachers, they exhibited characteristics of "best teacher" as described by the principal--they "individualize," "plan and organize," were "energetic," had "affinity for children and they show it," and "supported the school." Also they tended not to have children--an important factor in a teacher's willingness to volunteer for the numerous duties and responsibilities required at the school.

Formal Leadership.

Along with the principal, the formal leadership structure at Dixon included one assistant principal, a staff development coordinator, and five coordinators in the academic areas of math/science, language and social studies, special

programs (LD, EMH, EH, guidance, and school-within-school), enrichment (electives such as art, music, band, PE, and media), and vocations.

The assistant principal, a black male and a former coach, had his master's in administration and was expected to pursue his doctoral work. With "expertise in curriculum and instruction," his responsibilities included buses (supervising drivers, routes, and discipline), books, lockers, grounds, assembly seating, and student registration (along with the assistance of the guidance department), and membership on numerous committees. In addition, he had begun to observe and evaluate teachers--something the previous assistant principal never did at the school. Importantly the principal noted that while he was selected as assistant principal because he was "the best available black," the "community had never cozied up" to a black administrator.

The staff development coordinator was "assigned" to her position and "didn't know why." The principal noted her "visibility," "organization," and "dependability" as factors in this role of "getting courses" for the faculty. The area coordinators "channeled information" and served on the advisory budget committee and the core staff. Their selection was based on the principal's "pragmatism" and the district office wanting "basic skill people" in these roles. With all five academic coordinators being specialists (no regular classroom teaching responsibilities), the principal was able to "access" them without having to "get release time." Furthermore, the principal noted that these people had "credibility," "organizational skills," and he "could work with them." While the principal decided to "open it up" next year and have classroom teachers serve as members of the core staff, the fact that no classroom teachers were members of the planning group was of some concern to the present coordinators and other faculty.

The Political Network.

Even though race at Dixon tended to be noted as a factor in the formation of political networks, there was not an identifiable black nor while informal leadership structure. The political networks emerged in response to the nature of the school's mission and its numerous assigned duties and the particular teaching orientations of the "younger" and "older" faculty. If there was informal segregation at Dixon, it appeared to be a result of long-standing community patterns and traditions that inhibited black-white interaction.

Because of the significance of athletics and music in motivating Dixon's student to "buy into the school's values," coaches and the band and chorus teachers worked closely with the administration and met parents more frequently. Some coaches were disciplinarians and "quasi-administrators," (the principal and the assistant principal were former coaches.) and their "common interest" provided the basis for after-school socializing and informal leadership for both faculty and students. The principal worked closely with these faculty (and others who were involved heavily in student activities) to accomodate new demands that were placed on the school's resources. In turn, partly because of the principal's "distant" leadership style, there was a tendency for some faculty to attach status to the "close" relationships that were developing between the administrations and those involved in student activities.

The impact of the trifurcation among older, more academically-oriented teachers, coaches, and those that were younger and more activity-oriented was lessened by the fact that "no one (teachers) lived in the community." Given that teachers were characterized as "electic," "insular," and "being locked into schedules and numerous assigned duties," the full development of politically informal networks was problematic at Dixon. Furthermore, a

principal, who was "someone to dislike," "set in his ways," and authoritarian," provided a common bond among the three diverse groups at Dixon, and also established a leadership structure which afforded some meaning to those students who were not motivated by academics alone.

Survey Results

In comparision to Howard Junior High, Dixon's teachers tended to respond more strongly in one direction or the other. (See Table 1.) The teachers perceived hiring procedures not to be known and tended to view criteria also as not known. They were not sure that the criteria were used and tended to view administrators as selecting people with qualities the administrators themselves had. Finally, teachers desired more involvement in recruitment and selection. Concerning orientation of new personnel, Dixon teachers tended to agree that knowledge of effective practices were encouraged, that specific activities were planned for new personnel to understand these practices. The teachers tended to see the most knowledgeable as conveying these practices, but to a lesser extent than the other two items concerning orientation.

The teachers at Dixon tended to view observation for evaluation as not occurring frequently and were equivocal about how effectively it was conducted. They perceived that it identified strengths as well as weaknesses and was conducted by qualified people. Teachers tended to agree that it also revealed ways to improve practice. Staff development at Dixon seems to have been focussing on professional growth and job related problems, possibly to the exclusion of job responsibilities and personal growth.

Dixon teachers tended to agree that teachers with demonstrated high competence should receive a differentiated status and certainly be paid more. These staff should also train other teachers. Nevertheless, Dixon teachers were

almost unanimous agreement that those with such competence should be regularly reevaluated, again suggesting that the teachers were not convinced that differentiated status should be a permanent status. Finally, the teachers felt that competencies were shared by effective teachers and can be taught but were undecided or disagreed that they in fact were taught.

In short, the teachers at Dixon perceived selection and recruitment to be far from the PSC'S guidelines and that orientation occurred with some question as to the competence of those who provide it. Observation for evaluation was not seen as occurring frequently or effectively. Staff development tended to ignore job responsibilities and personal growth by emphasizing problems and professional growth. Dixon teachers tended to see differentiated status pay as appropriate, but wanted those so recognized to be subject to ongoing scrutiny even as they train other teachers. Finally, competencies that are shared and can be taught, are not.

The Plan.

The proposed plan for professionalization at Dixon changed the present departmental organization to enable the departments to become "more functional work groups." These new departments included (1) math and science, (2) language arts, (3) special programs, (4) social studies, foreign language, and media, and (5) enrichment (vocations, physical education, driver's education, art, music and band). The specific tasks of the departments included "among other things, curriculum improvement, socialization of new staff, and staff development."

These five positions were "considered open" by the principal and he encouraged all faculty members to apply. The principal was to select these coordinators--primarily on the basis of "interest, experience, professional growth (i.e., graduate work), and interpersonal skills." This Core group would

"be accountable to the administration, but the administration (would) not be a part of the Core group. Furthermore, the plan included the addition of one position-- "a full-time certified teacher to serve as a substitute for (the) Core staff and others." The plan emphasized "extra pay for extra time" for the new Core staffers. The five department coordinators would be paid $100 per month for ten months" and $500 for one additional week of employment" in the summer.

The plan at Dixon failed the PSC in not emphasizing the "technical norms of competence" similar to Howard Junior High. However, while Dixon retained the notion of departments, the departments themselves were reorganized and who headed them also was changed. Thus the departmental structure was not reconsidered, only one's place in the departments. As with Howard, the plan resulted in more teacher involvement, orientation, and staff development but it is the core staff's involvement primarily is facilitated given the principal's concern with keeping teachers "on duty". Some teacher observation was to be experimented with, but evaluation was to remain the legitimate province of the administration, as was selection of the coordinators.

Cui Bono

Dixon, unlike Howard, did not have a strong network in control of the planning process. In fact, the prior coordinators themselves perceived that they were not appropriate representatives of the faculty. The "broker" coaches of Dixon convinced the principal that a change was needed. In the end, the principal's new core staff represented all three networks (academics, coaches and activities). In political terms, the plan at Dixon did result in a new recognition of social networks, but not one over the others. Certainly the teachers as a single unit influenced the decisions and the structure, but the

principal ended up with a structure that can be seen as: a) representing the range of authentic teacher beliefs; b) coopting informal network leaders, or; c) creating a basis for network competition and the principal's emergence as a selective patron. The principal thus benefits by creating a structure seen both as more legitimate and more subject to political strategies. In the end, the networks gained representation in the formal structure but lost their unity in opposition to the principal.

## ACADEMY HIGH SCHOOL

### School, Mission, Climate.

In some respects, Academy High School took on the aura of a private, prep-type school in that most students shared common backgrounds and expectations regarding their upcoming university education (approximately "80% go to college"). Academy had an excellent "reputation" as many students were "responsive" and "highly motivated." The 980 students were primarily drawn from middle and upper-middle class backgrounds. For college-bound students at Academy the mean SAT score was 921 for the past academic year. Similarly, approximately 96% of the entire student body passed the reading and math sections of the statewide competency test. With many "good" and "highly motivated" students, the principal noted that "we're sort of an activity-oriented school." Students, themselves, were noted for their enthusiasm for "fun" courses such as fashion merchandising and computers, musical productions (which also served as "great PR"), and sixteen different boys and girls team sports (including lifetime activities like golf, soccer, swimming, and tennis). Advanced placement of "AG" students were picked by the faculty to be "teaching assistants" so that they may help with "grades and

rolls" and also to "fill their classes." Even though some teachers "didn't want them (the students) to miss their class" while participating in the many ongoing activities at Academy, the principal asserted the need for "both strong academics and strong activities." He noted that "learning does not all occur in the classroom." Academy's climate was characterized as being "purposeful, but not threatening." Generally, most teachers viewed the school as "good," "free" and "open." For faculty, this meant they "dressed like they wanted" and had a great deal of "classroom autonomy." Students also had freedom as they published an "underground newspaper." As one teacher noted the "concern (with the newspaper) would not be with what is in it, but that the papers (were) left on the floor." "Responsive" and "highly motivated" students and "lots of things to do" made Academy a "good place" for both teachers and students. However, if there was "one problem" it was believed to be a lack of "consistency" in student discipline. For some, the school was "laid back" and "probably too laid back"--as student discipline was "not tight as it should be."

The Principal.

The principal characterized himself as not having one particular leadership style. However, he viewed himself as an "expediter"--one who could keep the school "cohesive enough to head somewhere." He did not "supervise totally," but "read the road signs (watching out for trends)" and "provided general directions" so that "professionals could follow through." The principal was perceived by some teachers to have "little contact" with them. They noted: "He hires teachers and they teach" and "we handle curriculum, he handles personnel." As he usually "(told) the faculty a general rule" rather than "confronting the individual," some tended to believe the principal "avoided confrontations," possibly lending to the perception that he "procrastinates." Some teachers

tended to view him as a "public relations" man--one who was very diplomatic with parents, teachers, students, the county office, and the community at large. As one noted, he "can tell you to go to hell and you will look forward to the trip."

Teachers.

The faculty of Academy was approximately 86% white and 75% female. Of the 52-member instructional staff, 26 had baccalaureates, 23 had masters (o are M.Ed. and 14 M.A., M.S. or M.A.T.), and 3 had doctorates (all Ph.D.'s). Of the faculty at large, approximately 27% had less than five years experience, 22% had between six and ten, 8% had between eleven and fifteen, and 18% had between sixteen and twenty (data were not available for 25% of the faculty). The principal noted that the teachers at his school represented a "total range"--those that were "excellent" and those that were "marginal operators." Similarly, one teacher noted that along with the "excellent teachers" are some "real do-dos." However s(he) said, "we cover for each other" and the "courses that require good teachers get them." Generally, teachers asserted that they're a "secure" and "independent" group--much "like the students in the school." Some noted that the faculty was a "little cliquish" and "not warm or cohesive," but "most enjoy teaching and teen-agers." Others noted that the faculty is "concerned," "willing to do what needs to be done," very "protective of their classroom time," and "has a lot of talent unrelated to academics." For some there were a number of "excellent" teachers at Academy--those who "care about students as people," "give them time outside of class," "drive the active clubs," "are competent in their field," "are sought out by students," and "do more than they are paid for." The principal noted that "everyone normally is expected to have extra-duty" assignments and there is "more or less a job for

everyone." The principal "tried to appoint people who know the area"; for example, those who teach "honors classes were appointed to the guidance and scholarship committee. Some committees took up "very little (of teacher's) time" as they only met occasionally in the course of a year. Clubs tended to be teacher-initiated and the "outgrowth of the curriculum area." Some of the approximately 25 clubs at Academy were very "active" and "driven" by some of the "best teachers." However, a few teachers noted that starting a club "keeps you from being appointed to some thing you don't want." Athletic coaches at Academy did not get any further extracurricular assignments. While there were numerous supervised duties, 16 different sports, and odd jobs to be manned by teachers, they were rarely "coerced" into these roles as the principal had a way of "creating volunteers." As one teacher noted, "who is going to turn down the boss."

Formal Leadership.

Along with the principal, the formal leadership structure at Academy included two assistant principals, a registrar, and five academic coordinators (math, English, social studies, science, and foreign language). The responsibilities of one assistant principal included supervising teachers (both observation and evaluation), coordinating substitute teachers, serving as staff development coordinator and on the core staff. The responsibilities of the other assistant principal included discipline, textbook distribution, instructional supplies, and accounting. Also, he "made" lunch duty assignments, "monitored" parking, "patrolled" grounds, and "notified" parents about student attendance. One assistant principal noted that he was chosen for the "job" because of his "competency, loyalty, credentials, and experience." For him, he was "given" the staff development role because of his work in observation and

evaluation. The other assistant principal noted that he was chosen for his role because of his "overall performance" as a teacher and that he was "always involved." He found out about the vacancy for the position when the principal called him over the summer. The registrar was a "unique position" at Academy as the person in this role "created it" himself. Even though he was classified as a "secretary for pay purposes," he was a former administrator who worked with both the principal and the faculty. In some respects he was a "data manager"--doing "a lot of work (which) guidance normally does." Even though he requested considerable amounts of data from teachers, he tried to "respect their concern for time." The responsibilities of the academic coordinators included serving on the core staff, "working with the assistant principal" on "ordering books," "ordering supplies and materials," "keeping materials," attending "meetings," "channeling information," "sound(ing) out things" and "keeping everybody together." The principal noted that he selected the coordinators on the basis of their "teaching experience and success, credentials, and rapport with other faculty." When queried about the criteria for their selection, some coordinators noted credentials--"I was going to grad school" and "at the time I was the only one who had a masters"; one noted expertise--"most of us read the journals"; another noted rapport--"we're company people"; and still others were just not sure--"there was no pattern in coordinator selection" and it was "a mystery to me." Some teachers perceived that in order to be a coordinator all one needed to do was to be "willing to do much work for no money." However, the coordinators, themselves, perceived their roles as "not much" and that there was "no real authority." As one coordinator noted, since there was "no money (for compensation) or time (to do any more than what we are presently doing)" "no one expected us to do anything." Most coordinators tended to perceive little or no

compensation for their formal duties. On second thought, some coordinators mentioned "two paid days in the summer" and "money for professional meetings" as compensation. The principal viewed the development of the differentiated staffing program as an "opportunity to use the present structure more effectively." The status of the coordinators as school leaders had not changed since they became members of the core staff. This appeared to be so, in part, because most teachers (outside of the coordinators themselves) did not "know very much about the core staff." In fact, one coordinator noted that "only one faculty member expressed an interest in what (they were) doing." Further, as one teacher noted, we were in our "own world" and only "once in a blue moon (did we) plan together." In sum, teachers who occupied formal leadership roles at Academy tended to be those that the "principal had the most confidence in." Generally, they had "seniority," "credentials," and "tact," were "loyal and dependable," and "dedicated to the county." In a school where much activity took place and the principal worked hard at continually legitimizing those activities, it was not surprising that formal leaders exhibited characteristics such as seniority and credentials--characteristics which are often accepted as legitimate for leadersip promotion by society at large.

The Political Networks.

The informal leadership structure at Academy High School was demarcated by three major political networks, distinguished by their orientation toward teaching and school life, credentials, and age (years at the school). One network the "academics," was primarily concerned with subject matter. These teachers tended to serve on prestigious committees and generally did not sponsor activity clubs. They were "hardworkers" in their classrooms and their advanced degrees tended to be Master of Arts or Master of Arts in Teaching as opposed to

Master of Education. The second network, the "best teachers" was concerned with both academics and activities. These teachers tended to be perceived as "best" by both faculty (of all three networks) and students alike. They "cared about students as people" and "drove the active clubs at Academy."

Credential for these teachers ranged from bachelor's to doctorates. Both the "academics" and "best teachers" tended to be "older" and more "conservative and subdued" than that third network, the "developing teachers." These teachers, known as the "lounge lizards" because of their use of the school lounge for discussing their concerns, believed that they "looked at the school realistically." These teachers tended to serve on inactive committees, yet a few of them were "involved heavily into student activities." Some teachers characterized this network as posing "different standards"--especially in terms of "dress, language, and types of conversation." Other teachers noted that while the "developing" teachers may complain, it was more in terms of being "opinionated" about important teacher concerns--"low income," "lack of respect," and "unprofessional" assignments like "lunch duty." Credentials for these teachers tended to be limited to bachelors' degrees. What set the "developing teachers" off from other networks was the lounge itself. The lounge was small and somewhat "off the beaten track" for many teachers. While one teacher noted that the academics---sometimes referred to as "pseudo-intellectuals" didn't lower themselves by going into the lounge," others asserted that the "smokers" prevented "a lot" of teachers from "using" the lounge. However, the lounge provided the opportunity for some teachers in the developing teacher network to "share" ideas about their classes. This was particularly true for "math and English" teachers who frequently worked together in the lounge. This bothered some teachers who were on break and requested from time to time that they

"please take the math out of the lounge." Also, the lounge provided a "release" and a "support group" for these younger teachers who seemingly did not particularly mesh well with the other two networks. Subsequently, the "size," "smoke," and "topics of conversation" in the lounge set these "developing teachers" off from other networks and tended to limit cross-network interaction.

If there was a boundary spanning network, it was the "best teachers." There appeared to be "mutual respect" between the "psuedo-intellectuals" and the "best teachers" as they shared some common academic concerns, experience, and tended to represent the high standards for which Academy High School was known. Similarly, there appeared to be a common bond between the "lounge lizards" and the "best teachers" as they shared common student activity concerns which enhanced the reputation that Academy possessed. Notably, those teachers in the "academic" or "pseudo-intellectual" network tended to nominate "best teachers," not "lounge lizards" as the best teachers in the school. Similarly, those teachers in the "lounge lizards" networks tended to nominate "best teachers," not "academics" as the best teachers in the school. The "academics" and the "best teacher" networks tended to have more positional power (and influence with the administration) as they were more likely to occupy formal leadership roles and less likely to be members of less desirable committees and sponsors of club assignments. Teachers in these two networks were not inclined to socialize outside of the school and were very "independent." In fact, these teachers tend to be rather insular when it came to their classroom work. The "developing teachers" appeared to be promoting new "standards" at Academy and possibly as a result were perceived by others as "not necessarily good teachers." The "developing teachers" appeared to be heavily invested within the network as they "did a lot of things together" outside of school, shared instructional ideas,

and provided mutual "support." These younger staff were learning their craft by doing it and sharing with those in a similar position.

Survey Results.

The survey responses from Academy High tended to be bimodal. Concerning recruitment and selection, teachers were split between agreeing and disagreeing that hiring procedures are known. Teachers tended to agree or be undecided about hiring criteria being known and personnel being chosen based on the criteria. They tended to agree that administrators sought people with like qualities or were undecided. The teachers desired more involvement in the recruitment and selection processes. Concerning orientation, the teachers again split between agree and disagree on whether effective practices were conveyed to new personnel, are conveyed by the most knowledgable, and whether activities were planned for this to occur.

Teachers at Academy High did not see observation for evaluation as occurring frequently, but tended to see it as conducted by qualified people and identifying strengths and weaknesses. Nevertheless, the teachers were less sure that it revealed ways to improve, and tended to believe that it was not conducted effectively. Staff development has seemingly concentrated on job-related problems with professional growth being second. Personal growth and job responsibilities tended not be the emphasis of staff development, but again the responses may be considered bimodal.

Academy teachers tended to agree that teachers with demonstrated high competence should have a differentiated status, receive more pay, and even more should train other teachers. Like at Dixon and Howard, however, teachers thought those with demonstrated competence should be regularly reevaluated.

Effective teachers at Academy share competencies and tended to believe they can be taught but were not.

In sum, Academy teachers tended to disagree with each other's perceptions. However, it was clear that recruitment and selection processes are not well understood, that orientation is subject to some difference of opinion, that observation for evaluation was not viewed as occurring effectively, often, or revealing ways to improve. Staff development seemed to have had a strong "problems" orientation. Differentiated staffing was agreeable but only if it is not a permanent status. Finally, Academy teachers perceived competencies to be shared but were not being taught. Academy teachers, further, were less likely than either Howard or Dixon teachers to view the competencies to be to view the competencies to be teachable.

The Plan

The proposed plan for the professionalization at the school, developed by the core staff and the principal, "expanded" and "strengthened" the role of the department coordinators "through the devices of release time" and "extended employment." Aside from the usual teaching responsibilities; their new duties were extensive, including many clerical and scheduling tasks that formally had been the responsibility of the administration as well as the instructional coordinators duties. These teachers were also to begin to assist in evaluating other teachers and to "make recommendations to the principal for hiring (new teachers)". While the coordinators were to evaluate other teachers formally in the second year of the program, they were to do so only in "coordination with either the principal or the assistant principal." The coordinators would continue to be selected by the principal on the basis of their "ability to lead, initiative, and capacity for hard work."

Like Howard and Dixon, the local planning effort avoided differentiating staff based on the "technical norms of competence" for teachers, and reinforced the belief that these roles had requirements separate from those the PSC wished to reward. The existing structure was unchanged, with the exception of the administration relegating clerical and scheduling responsibilities to the core staff. The principal retained final decision making authority while the core staff made recommendations. As with the other two schools, the plan facilitated development of the department coordinators more directly than the development of the overall teaching force.

Cui Bono

Academy High withdrew from the program after the plan was accepted by the school system, and retained its existing structure. Further, there was considerable turnover in departmental coordinators. In the end, the "Academic" network solidified their formal authority, the "best teachers" withdrew, and the "developing teachers" continued to not be represented or involved. In this scenario, the "Academics" benefitted. However, the devise of the plan itself seemed to benefit both the principal and the "best teachers." The principal had served as a distant authority figure, but an active one-on-one patron to individual teachers. The plan jeopardized this latter relationship by legitimating the authority of coordinators and thus creating the potential for coordinators to become the main patrons. The "best teachers" came to define the plan and its goals as a "bunch of malarkey." In their view, the plan converted coordinators to clerks and would not reward technical teaching competence. Like the "best teachers" at Howard, Academy's "best teachers" elected to keep their informal status, by negating the plan and its potential to give authority to those the "best teachers" regarded as not technically the "best". The "best

teachers" continued to be the "opinion makers", the principal continued to be a one-on-one patron to individual teachers, the Academics gained some formal authority, and the developing teachers continued not to be involved.

## The Politics of Planning

Planning in educational organizations is often used as control, as is certainly the case here. The PSC carefully controlled who would be involved in the program's goal setting. Even further, the PSC went on to specify "understandings" and "guiding principles" that were to shape the local schools' plans. Even with all this control, however, authentic forces of the local school level were able to wrought plans that served some local interest. The compelling local interest was the status quo in terms of principal's authority and the existing structure, but this type of statement dramatically underestimates the struggle to defend the status quo. In each school, the interests of teacher networks were at issue. Networks with high informal status (i.e., "best teacher") in the schools with rather distinctive, possible factional, networks, concluded that formalyzing their authority was not desirable. They already were the "opinion makers" and could only see this power as being confounded by seeking positions of new authority and their status as being jeopardized by the rationalization of the status of technical teaching competence through the plan. To the "best teachers", the PSC's morphology did not recognize professionalism as they defined it.

For teacher networks without status, the PSC's morphology was an opportunity to recognize their contributions and reward them with formal authority. Yet the planning process was an opportunity only for those who were included, and that ultimately was the principal's decision. The "academics" or

"pseudo intellectuals" took advantage of this in both Howard and Academy (even though in the latter case they took advantage of the design of the plan).

At Dixon Junior High, the networks were less concerned about their relationships to each other than the relationship between teachers as a group and the principal. To that end, the teacher networks all negotiated representation on the core staff. Now seemingly equal in formal authority and status, it remains to be seen whether politics and emotion will lead to an informal differentiation with the principal emerging as the key patron. When networks negotiate differential status and authority, a political structure may be reified, but when they negotiate equal status and authority, reifying the political structure may be more difficult. Equality somehow is always more difficult to ensure than stratification.

We have tried to use political clientelism as a framework to conceptualize the irrational in the planning process. The network politics and the struggle between legitimacy and authenticity of each school can be studied as systematically as can rationality. Certainly, it is not as neat not and certain as rational structures, but then rationality is but a idea that is neat and certain only because it is so believed. Politics is also bit an idea. Yet we allow it to be mystical, metaphorical and/or dirty. Yet to be sure, the order that we see in schools and in planning is as much a product of the political structure, the irrational, as it is at the rational structure. In fact, as we have shown here that, in organizations order results from the struggle between rational morphologies and political substructures, and not either alone. Possibly it is better to conceive of planning not as a rational proces, but as a contention around which interests are expressed and alliances are formed. To understand this seems to require a dialectical analysis which:

...is not restricted to the narrow, limited conventional reality promulated by administrators. Its focus is the total organization from which this limited segment has been wrenched. If analyses the intricate ways in which the organization as a rationally articulated structure is linked to its unrationalized context; it explores and uncovers the social and political processes through which a segmental view becomes dominant and is enforced; and, it anticipates the emergence of new arrangements based on shifting power relations. Thus, the dialetical view takes the rationalized organization as an arbitrary model unevenly imposed on events and insecure in its hold (Benson, 1981: 42)

## References

J.E. Benson (1981) Organizations: A dialectical view. In O. Grusky and G. Miller (eds). The sociology of organizations. New York: Free Press.

D.L. Clark et al (1980) New perspectives on planning in educational organizations. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory.

W.G. Cunningham (1982) Systematic planning for educational change. Pal Alto, CA: Mayfield.

A. Gouldner (1970) The coming crisis of Western sociology. New York: Basic Books.

R.E. Herriott and N. Gross (1979) The dynamics of planned educational change. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

M. Hibbard (1981). The crisis in social policy planning. Social Service Review SS:4, 557-567.

K. Mannheim (.936) Ideology and atopia. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

M. Metz (1978) Classrooms and Corridors. Berkeley: University of California Press.

S. Schmidt et al (1977) Friends, followers and factions. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

R. L. Warren, S. M. Rose and A.F. Bergunder (1974) The structure of urban reform. Lexington, Mass: Lexington Books.

TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS

| | | DIXON JUNIOR HIGH n=26 | | | HOWARD JUNIOR HIGH n=31 | | | ACADEMY HIGH n=34 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | AGREE | UNDECIDED | DISAGREE | AGREE | UNDECIDED | DISAGREE | AGREE | UNDECIDED | DISAGREE |
| **A.** | **CONCERNING THE RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL IN MY SCHOOL, I FEEL THAT ...** | | | | | | | | | |
| | the procedures for determining who should be hired are generally known | (1) 11.5 | 11.5 | 77 | 48.4 | 29 | 19.4 | 41.2 | 17.6 | 41.2 |
| | the criteria for determining who should be hired are generally known | (2) 23.1 | 19.2 | 57.7 | 32.3 | 38.7 | 25.8 | 38.2 | 32.4 | 29.4 |
| | new presonnel are chosen based on these criteria | (3) 19.2 | 61.5 | 19.2 | 32.3 | 51.6 | 6.5 | 38.2 | 32.4 | 23.5 |
| | administrators possess the same qualities in which they seek in new personnel | (4) 23.1 | 30.8 | 46.2 | 45.2 | 29.0 | 22.6 | 44.1 | 35.3 | 17.6 |
| | teachers desire more involvement in this process | (5) 65.4 | 26.9 | 7,7 | 54.8 | 41.9 | 3.2 | 64.7 | 20.6 | 14.7 |
| **B.** | **CONCERNING THE ORIENTATION OF NEW PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL IN MY SCHOOL I FEEL THAT ...** | | | | | | | | | |
| | knowledge concerning practices for effective teaching is conveyed to these new personnel | (6) 53.8 | 15.4 | 30.8 | 67.7 | 16.1 | 16.1 | 44.1 | 14.7 | 41.2 |
| | these practices are conveyed by those considered to be most knowledgable | (7) 42.3 | 26.9 | 30.8 | 45.2 | 32.3 | 19.4 | 44.1 | 14.7 | 35.3 |
| | specific activities are planned for new personnel to understand these practices | (8) 61.5 | 19.2 | 15.4 | 38.7 | 29.0 | 32.3 | 44.1 | 20.6 | 35.3 |

| | | DIXON JUNIOR HIGH | | | HOWARD JUNIOR HIGH | | | ACADEMY HIGH | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | AGREE | UNDECIDED | DISAGREE | AGREE | UNDECIDED | DISAGREE | AGREE | UNDECIDED | DISAGREE |
| C. | IN MY SCHOOL I FEEL THAT OBSERVATION FOR EVALUATION PURPOSES... | | | | | | | | | |
| | occurs frequently | (9) 38.5 | 15.4 | 46.2 | 45.2 | 16.1 | 35.5 | 29.4 | 11.8 | 58.8 |
| | is conducted by qualified persons | (10) 65.4 | 23.1 | 11.5 | 58.1 | 19.4 | 22.6 | 47.1 | 23.5 | 29.4 |
| | identifies strengths as well as weaknesses | (11) 73.1 | 15.4 | 11.5 | 54.8 | 19.4 | 25.8 | 58.8 | 14.7 | 26.5 |
| | reveals ways to inform and improve practice | (12) 53.8 | 7.7 | 34.6 | 35.5 | 25.8 | 35.5 | 26.5 | 35.3 | 38.2 |
| | is conducted effectively | (13) 30.8 | 30.8 | 38.5 | 41.9 | 22.6 | 35.5 | 29.4 | 26.5 | 44.1 |
| D. | IN MY SCHOOL I FEEL THAT STAFF DEVELOPMENT HAS CENTERED ON... | | | | | | | | | |
| | job responsibilities | (14) 23.1 | 11.5 | 61.5 | 48.4 | 12.9 | 35.3 | 38.2 | 8.8 | 50.0 |
| | job-related problems | (15) 65.4 | 7.7 | 23.1 | 90.3 | 6.5 | 3.2 | 73.5 | 8.8 | 14.7 |
| | opportunities which provide for my professional growth | (16) 67.7 | 7.7 | 34.6 | 74.2 | 6.5 | 19.4 | 52.9 | 11.8 | 35.3 |
| | opportunities which provide for my personal growth | (17) 38.5 | 3.8 | 57.7 | 61.3 | 19.4 | 16.1 | 41.2 | 5.9 | 50.0 |
| E. | IN MY SCHOOL I FEEL THAT TEACHERS WHO DEMONSTRATE HIGH LEVELS OF COMPETENCE... | | | | | | | | | |
| | should have a formally recognized and differentiated status | (18) 50.0 | 23.1 | 26.9 | 51.6 | 22.6 | 25.8 | 55.9 | 29.4 | 14.7 |
| | should receive additional salary | (19) 69.2 | 7.7 | 23.1 | 58.1 | 22.6 | 19.4 | 55.9 | 23.5 | 17.6 |